

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED	INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/955,979	(09/20/2001	Jang Jin Yoo		041501-5452	041501-5452 1915	
9629	7590	06/03/2004			EX	AMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP					AKKAPEI	AKKAPEDDI, PRASAD R	
WASHING			i e i		EXAMIN AKKAPEDDI, I	PAPER NUMBER	
	•	•			2871		

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/955,979	YOO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	·
	Prasad R Akkapeddi	2871	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap			
eriod for Reply			• •
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI	LY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MO	NTH(S) FROM	,
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1			
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.			
 If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a regift NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period 	I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH	IS from the mailing date of this communic	ation.
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili	te, cause the application to become ABAN	JDONED (35 H.S.C. & 133)	
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		- y,y	
tatus			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 I	March 2004		•
	s action is non-final.	• •	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		e proposition on to the manufacture	
closed in accordance with the practice under			iS'
order in accordance with the practice under	LA Parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	i i, 400 U.G. 213.	
sposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2 and 4-17</u> is/are pending in the ap	nlication		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	iwn nom consideration.		•
6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/c	or election requirement.		
oplication Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 June 2002</u> is/are: a			5- 2-
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached O	ffice Action or form PTO-152.	
iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
		• * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	٠.
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	19(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:			
1 🛛 Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		ication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio			: · ·
application from the International Bureau		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		eived	
	The second sepide not let		•
	·		
achment(s)		•	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sumi		
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/M		
TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	5) L Notice of Inform	nal Patent Application (Pi	

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/23/2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1,4-8,10, and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto et al. (Kishimoto) (U.S.Patent No. 6,396,559) in view of Kume et al. (Kume) (U.S.Patent No. 6,115,098).

As to claims 1 and 4: Kishimoto discloses a liquid crystal display device (Fig. 1) comprising an insulating film (overcoat layer 104, of an acrylic or an epoxy resin col. 4, lines 34-35. Note: the layer 1004 in Fig. 16 is similar to the layer 104 in Fig. 1) on a first substrate (101), a first electrode (105) having a plurality of slit patterns directly contacting the insulating film (104), a light-

Art Unit: 2871

shielding layer (102), that is also a black matrix (BM) below the first electrode (105) and the slit patterns, a second electrode (121) on a second substrate (120), a liquid crystal layer (9) between the first (101) and the second (120) substrates.

Kishimoto teaches that with a voltage application, there will be only one orientation axis in each liquid crystal region (9) which then has only one axially symmetric orientation region "multi-domain" (col. 15, lines 20-23).

Although Kishimoto teaches each region having axially symmetric orientation and having multi-domains, Kishimoto does not elaborate the axially symmetry.

Kume in disclosing a liquid crystal device having slit patterns in the first electrode and having axial symmetry of the molecules (Fig. 1A and col. 11, lines 12-34), teaches that axial symmetry refers to several different orientations of the liquid crystal molecules (col. 10, lines 35-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the definition of axial symmetry as taught by Kume to the axially symmetric nature of the molecules as taught by Kishimoto to widen the viewing angle that is suitable for use in flat display in a personal computer, a word processor, a TV set or the like (col. 1, lines 8-12).

As to claims 5: Kishimoto discloses the first electrode (105) is a transparent electrode of ITO, a transparent conductive material (col. 16, line 8)

As to claim 6: Kishimoto discloses that the second electrode (121) is made of ITO, a transparent conductive material (col. 16, line 21).

Art Unit: 2871

As to claim 7: Kishimoto discloses that the insulating film (104) is on the entire surface of the first substrate (Fig. 1).

As to claim 8: Kishimoto a method for producing a liquid crystal display (col. 16, lines 33-67 and col. 17, lines 1-38 and Figs. 2A-2F) comprising forming a black matrix (light shielding layer 102) on the first substrate (101) (Fig. 2A), forming an overcoat layer (104) on the entire first substrate and the black matrix (Fig. 2C), forming a first electrode (105) having a plurality of slit patterns (Fig. 2D), forming a second electrode (121) (Fig. 2E), forming a liquid crystal layer (9) (Fig. 2F) and the assembly of the first and second substrates (col. 17, lines 10-11).

Kishimoto teaches that with a voltage application, there will be only one orientation axis in each liquid crystal region (9) which then has only one axially symmetric orientation region "multi-domain" (col. 15, lines 20-23).

Although Kishimoto teaches each region having axially symmetric orientation and having multi-domains, Kishimoto does not elaborate the axially symmetry.

Kume in disclosing a liquid crystal device having slit patterns in the first electrode and having axial symmetry of the molecules (Fig. 1A and col. 11, lines 12-34), teaches that axial symmetry refers to several different orientations of the liquid crystal molecules (col. 10, lines 35-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the definition of axial symmetry

Art Unit: 2871

as taught by Kume to the axially symmetric nature of the molecules as taught by Kishimoto to widen the viewing angle that is suitable for use in flat display in a personal computer, a word processor, a TV set or the like (col. 1, lines 8-12).

As to claim 10: Kishimoto teaches that the light -shielding layer (black matrix, 102) is formed below each slit pattern (Fig. 1).

As to claims 12: Kishimoto discloses the first electrode (105) is a transparent electrode of ITO, a transparent conductive material (col. 16, line 8)

As to claim 13: Kishimoto discloses that the second electrode (121) is made of ITO, a transparent conductive material (col. 16, line 21).

As to claim 14: Kishimoto discloses that the insulating film (104) is on the entire surface of the first substrate (Fig. 1).

As to claims 15-17: Kishimoto discloses that the first electrode (105) and the light-shielding layer (black matrix 102) are within a same pixel region. Note: Kishimoto defines a pixel region consists of a set of R,G,B color resin layers (col. 13,line 52) and it can be seen that the pixel region is shown in its entirety in Fig. 1, hence the first electrode and the light-shielding regions are within the same pixel unit, as disclosed by Kishimoto.

Art Unit: 2871

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2, 9 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

A search of the prior art did not disclose a liquid crystal display device or a method of fabricating such a device wherein the light-shielding layer is formed below either the middle portion of the first electrode or the middle portions of both the first electrode and the slit patterns.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 03/23/2004, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Kishimoto in view of Kume.

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prasad R Akkapeddi whose telephone number is 571-272-2285. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM to 5:30PM M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRA

Prasad R Akkapeddi, Ph.D Examiner Art Unit 2871

RIMARY EXAMINER